



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

81  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/913,454	08/14/2001	Liqun Chen	B-4278PCT	9593
22879	7590	07/18/2006	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			NGUYEN, MINH DIEU T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2137	

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/913,454	CHEN ET AL.
	Examiner Minh Dieu Nguyen	Art Unit 2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-43 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 44-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. This action is in response to the communication dated May 8, 2006 with the cancellation of claims 1-43 and the amendments to claims 52, 54 and 57.
2. Claims 44-64 are pending.
3. The objection of claim 54 and the 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 57 have been withdrawn due to their appropriate corrections.

### *Response to Arguments*

4. Applicant's arguments filed on May 8, 2006 have been fully considered. The office regrets "determine an actual module configuration" is disclosed by Drews' Figure 4 on the previous Office action (page 3, section 8, lines 8-9) was cited by mistake. Figure 4 (or Fig. 3, step 113) is relied on for the teaching of a stored module configuration which was addressed on the previous Office action (page 3, section 8, line 4) as col. 3, line 9, lines 17-18. The result of Fig. 3, steps 114-116 is relied on for the teaching of an actual module configuration, the step of comparing the actual module configuration against the stored module configuration is anticipated in Fig. 3, step 117 (or Fig. 5) in particular, in Fig. 5, step 207, if the comparison result is not equal, then the modification request is rejected (i.e. new or modified configuration data is rejected, therefore the computer stops operating under the new/modified/actual configuration data).

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 44-47, 50, 52-53 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drews (6,539,480) in view of Selitrennikoff et al. (6,209,089).

a) As to claims 44 and 52, Drews discloses a method and apparatus for securely transferring trust from a current trusted authority to a new trusted authority in a computing system comprising storing a module configuration of the computer apparatus (col. 3, line 9, 17-18); the trusted device performing a cryptographic identification process for modules with a cryptographic identity to identify them (Fig. 2, element 106; col. 4, lines 43-46; Fig. 3, element 114-116) and thereby determine an actual module configuration (Fig. 4); the trusted device comparing the actual module configuration against the stored module configuration (Fig. 3, element 117); and the trusted device inhibiting function of the computer apparatus while the actual module configuration does not satisfactorily match the stored module configuration (Fig. 5, element 210).

Drews does not expressly disclose a module configuration providing an identification of each functional module in the computer apparatus.

Selitrennikoff discloses a method and system for adjusting an operating system configuration according to changes in hardware components comprising a module configuration providing an identification of each functional module in the computer apparatus (col. 13, lines 20-24; Fig. 3, element 40).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of having a module configuration providing an identification of each functional module in the computer apparatus in the system of Drews as Selitrennikoff teaches so as to accurately verify the functional modules.

- b) As to claim 45, Drews discloses the stored module configuration is held separately from the computing apparatus (i.e. over the network, col. 3, lines 34-36).
- c) As to claims 46-47 and 58, Drews discloses the stored module configuration is stored such that it is accessible only by a cryptographic authentication process (this claimed limitation is addressed in the above claim 1, Drews discloses the validation and authentication process with the use of public/private key, hashing and digital signature.
- d) As to claim 50, please see the addressed above claim 44.
- e) As to claim 53, the claimed limitations are addressed in the above claims 45 and 46.

7. Claims 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herzi et al. (6,353,885) in view of Selitrennikoff et al. (6,209,089).

- a) As to claim 54, Herzi discloses a system and method for providing BIOS level user configuration of a computer system where the smart card (i.e. a security token) contains BIOS level settings (i.e. stored module configuration, col. 3, lines 54-57; col. 3, lines 5-13) and adapts to provide the stored module configuration to the

computer apparatus to allow comparison between an actual module configuration of the computer apparatus and the stored module configuration (Fig. 3, element 78).

Herzi does not expressly disclose the stored module configuration providing an identification of each function module.

Selitrennikoff discloses a method and system for adjusting an operating system configuration according to changes in hardware components comprising a module configuration providing an identification of each functional module in the computer apparatus (col. 13, lines 20-24; Fig. 3, element 40).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of having a module configuration providing an identification of each functional module in the computer apparatus in the system of Herzi as Selitrennikoff teaches so as to accurately verify the functional modules.

b) As to claim 55, the examiner takes official notice that storing information in an encrypted form is quite well known in the data encryption art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of storing the stored module configuration in an encrypted form in the system of Herzi and Selitrennikoff so as to securely protect the configuration data.

c) As to claim 56, Herzi discloses the security token is a smart card (Fig. 1, element 28).

8. Claims 48-49, 57, 59 and 60-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drews (6,539,480) in view of Selitrennikoff et al. (6,209,089) and further in view of Herzi et al. (6,353,885).

a) As to claim 57, Drews discloses a method and apparatus for securely transferring trust from a current trusted authority to a new trusted authority in a computing system comprising storing a module configuration of the computer apparatus (col. 3, line 9, 17-18); checking the actual module configuration against the stored module configuration (Fig. 3, element 117); and inhibiting function of the computer apparatus if the actual module configuration does not satisfactorily match the stored module configuration (Fig. 5, element 210).

Drews does not expressly disclose a module configuration providing an identification of each functional module in the computer apparatus.

Selitrennikoff discloses a method and system for adjusting an operating system configuration according to changes in hardware components comprising a module configuration providing an identification of each functional module in the computer apparatus (col. 13, lines 20-24; Fig. 3, element 40).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of having a module configuration providing an identification of each functional module in the computer apparatus in the system of Drews as Selitrennikoff teaches so as to accurately verify the functional modules.

Drews and Selitrennikoff do not expressly disclose storing a module configuration of the computer apparatus on a security token removably attachable to the computer apparatus.

Herzi discloses a system and method for providing BIOS level user configuration of a computer system where the smart card (i.e. a security token) contains BIOS level settings (i.e. stored module configuration, col. 3, lines 54-57; col. 3, lines 5-13).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of storing a module configuration on a security token in the system of Drews and Selitrennikoff so as to flexibly provide a user configuration in a multi-user computer system environment.

b) As to claim 59, Drews discloses the computer apparatus contains a trusted device (i.e. security module, Fig. 1, element 30) adapted to respond to a user in a trusted manner and the trusted device is adapted to perform the step of checking the actual module configuration against the stored module configuration (Fig. 3, element 117).

c) As to claims 48-49 and 60-63, please see the addressed above claim 57.

9. Claims 51 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drews (6,539,480) in view of Selitrennikoff et al. (6,209,089) in view of Herzi et al. (6,353,885) and further in view of Mufic (5,943,423).

Herzi discloses the module configuration is held by a remote module validation authority, however Drews and Herzi do not disclose the remote validation authority

provides a service allowing a replacement security token to be provided if a security token is lost or stolen.

Muftic discloses applications of the smart card technology to computer and network access, software distribution comprising a service allowing a replacement security token to be provided if a security token is lost or stolen (col. 6, lines 50-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of replacing lost or stolen security token as Muftic teaches in the system of Drews, Selitrennikoff and Herzi so as not to disrupt the smart card services.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Dieu Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3873.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mdn  
mdn  
7/13/06

Gilbert Barron Jr.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100